

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of *7* Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial

DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 10 33

Press
Mis

Dated 26. 7

18 71.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

26th July 1871.

Read the following papers :—

No. 156. From J. FRASER, Esq., Magistrate of the Godavery District, to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Cocanada, 22nd May 1871, No. 112.

I have the honour to inform you that a few days ago a native French subject, named Sangady Atchi, a resident of Yanam, was accused there of having been accessory to a heinous crime committed in French territory and afterwards took refuge in the village of Neelapilly, adjacent British territory.

2. Her arrest and surrender was immediately claimed by the *Chéf de Service* of Yanam.

3. As it appeared to me that I was obliged to act under the provisions of Act VII. of 1854, I replied that I could not surrender the criminal without the orders of my own Government. But the authorities at Yanam demur to this, and consider that they are entitled to the criminal's immediate and unconditional

surrender.* Meantime the criminal has surrendered herself in Yanam. But I ask the instructions of Government for my future guidance and for communication to the French authorities in Yanam. The only treaty on the subject, of which I have copy here, is dated 7th March 1815, and provides in Article 9 that "All Europeans and others whosoever against whom judicial proceedings shall be instituted within the limits of the settlements or factories belonging to his Most Christian Majesty, for offences committed, or for debts contracted, within the said limits, and who shall take refuge out of the same, shall be delivered up to the Chiefs of the said settlements and factories, and all Europeans and others whosoever against whom judicial proceedings as aforesaid, shall be instituted without the said limits, and who shall take refuge within the same, shall be delivered up by the Chiefs of the said settlements and factories upon demand being made of them by the British Government." But even notwithstanding that, Section 23 of Act VII. of 1854 seems to me to require the previous permission of Government in writing for the surrender of any person.

* *Vide* original letter.

Translation of a letter from the Provisional Chief of the Service at Yanam, to the Collector of the Godavery District, dated 17th May 1871, No. 3.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant, No. 108, regarding the extradition applied for in my letter of the 13th idem, No. 2; first, of a woman named Sangady Atchi, a native of French territory, who took refuge at Neelapilly (British territory), and second, of a man named Sedalouva Maridava, of the Brahmin caste, a native of British territory and residing there, who is accused of complicity in an attempt at murder committed in the French territory of Yanam.

As regards the latter, a British subject, I can only accept the fact of your refusal to deliver him up, and of the reservation you have notified to me of arraigning him before a British tribunal under the Act of 1854, if there be ground, and I beg you will say that there is but a mere accusation against this individual; and that I asked you to cause him to be brought to Yanam, mainly that he might hear and be confronted with the perpetrator of the crime and the witnesses. He can do this of his own accord, as the information shows that there is no ground for prosecuting him. In the contrary event, I shall forward to you the papers and everything else necessary to keep you informed.

G.O. No. 2776. H.O. 11/8/11

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
26th July 1871.

As regards Sangady Atchi, a native of French territory, and domiciled there, permit me to ask you whether it is not by the commission of a material error that she has been included in the same decision passed by you.

I am the more confirmed in this supposition, since, holding as I do authority from my Government to do the needful in all cases of applications for the extradition of British subjects accused of crimes or common misdemeanors, I concluded from that, that, by reciprocity, French subjects applied for, under the same conditions, by the French authorities, must be delivered up.

I have, however, to inform you that the accused, Sangady Atchi, came here yesterday and delivered herself up as a prisoner. Thus the difficulty, in the particular case which has engaged our attention, has been solved; but I shall be obliged to you, nevertheless, if you will be so good as to answer the foregoing question with reference to the principle involved in it, in order to prevent any doubt, any misunderstanding in similar cases, which may arise hereafter.

P. S.—When I closed this letter, I received your further letter of the 16th. In reply, I can only refer you to the foregoing letter to see that we must wait until the trial has terminated.

No. 157. From J. H. GARSTIN, Esq., Collector and Special Agent, South Arcot, to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Cuddalore, 21st June 1871, No. 75.

In forwarding a copy of a letter from the Superintendent of Police of this District, asking me to demand the extradition of one George Hastings charged with cheating, and for whose arrest a warrant has been issued by the Commissioner of Police at Madras, I have the honour to state, that, in my opinion, I have no authority to make this demand, and to request instructions from Government on the general question of the Special Agent's power of making demands for extradition from the Pondicherry authorities, and for complying with those made by them of him.

2. I find that it has been customary for many years (ever since 1838 I believe) for the Special Agent to demand the extradition of offenders taking refuge in Pondicherry, and for the Pondicherry authorities to make demands for extradition from the Special Agent of French offenders taking refuge in this district, the demands made by either party being seldom refused and being made at discretion and without reference to the Madras Government.

3. On looking over the records of the Special Agent's Office, I find that the office was first constituted in 1819 when Colonel Stuart Fraser was appointed, as the Madras Government inform him in their letter of the 13th December of that year, "with the view of forwarding and facilitating the transactions of public business and in order to preserve a right understanding with the Governments of the several foreign powers having settlements on the coast of Coromandel," and in his letter to the French Governor-General Count Dupuy, of the same date, the Chief Secretary says at paragraph 2, "I request your Excellency to understand that this measure, though adopted as an arrangement of general expediency, is not intended to interrupt, in any degree, the usual course of official correspondence," so that, unless it was intended by the above letter to Colonel Fraser that the power of making demands for extradition under Article 9 of the Treaty of 1815 should be conferred upon him, I do not see how any such power could be legally exercised by his successors, for by the wording of the said Article 9 "all Europeans and others whosoever against whom judicial proceedings shall be instituted within the limits of the settlements and factories belonging to his Most Christian Majesty, for offences committed, or for

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
26th July 1871.

"debts contracted, within the said limits, and who shall take refuge out of the same, shall be delivered up to the Chiefs of the said settlements and factories, and all Europeans and others whosoever against whom judicial proceedings as aforesaid shall be instituted without the said limits, and who shall take refuge within the same, shall be delivered up by the Chiefs of the said settlements and factories upon demand being made of them by the British Government." So that it would seem all demands for extradition by the French authorities can be made to the Special Agent and should be complied with by him, but all demands for extradition by the Special Agent must be made through his Government to the French authorities.

4. It will be very easy for me to do as my predecessors have done, and to act according to my discretion in demanding the surrender of George Hastings or not; but, before making such a demand, I think it right to ascertain whether the Government are aware of the existing practice, and whether it has their approval and sanction, and, in the latter case, whether demands for extradition should be limited strictly to the offences detailed in Section 21, Act VII. of 1854; or whether a demand for extradition should be made in every case of a criminal offence having been established *prima facie* against an individual taking refuge in a foreign settlement, it being left to the Foreign authorities to accede to, or refuse, the demands; or, lastly, whether, in every case in which it may be deemed proper that extradition should be demanded, such demand should be forwarded to Government.

5. I presume that the same rules should be followed in acceding to or refusing extradition demands as in making them.

From the Superintendent of Police, South Arcot, to the Madras Government and Special Agent, South Arcot, dated Oolundoorpett, 15th July 1871, No. 160.

One George Hastings on a charge of cheating has absconded from Madras and taken refuge in Pondicherry. A warrant has been issued for his arrest by the Commissioner of Police in Madras. I have the honour to request you will be good enough to address the French authorities in Pondicherry to surrender the above offender to our Police who are watching his movements there.

No. 158. ORDER THEREON, 26th July 1871, No. 1033.

The letters above recorded have reference to the reciprocal surrender, on the part of the British and French Governments, of persons, who, being charged with the commission of offences in the territory of the one State, take refuge in that of the other.

2. In the first letter, the Magistrate of the Godavery District reports that an application having been made to him by the Chef de Service at Yanam for the rendition of a woman, a native of that place, charged with complicity in an attempt to commit murder, he intimated, in reply, that, under the provisions of the Extradition Act VII. of 1854, the accused could not be delivered up without the special order of this Government, but that the Chef de Service has questioned the necessity for any such order, contending that as the French Government has empowered its officers to dispose of all applications for extradition made by officers of the British Government, without reference to superior authority, a reciprocal course should be observed in regard to similar applications made by the French authorities. In the present case the accused person, it is stated, has since surrendered herself at Yanam.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
26th July 1871.

Mr. Fraser, however, requests the instructions of Government on the subject for future guidance.

3. In the second letter, the Special Agent in South Arcot refers to an application made to him by the District Superintendent of Police for demanding, of the French authorities at Pondicherry, the rendition of a British subject accused of cheating (whose arrest, however, has since been otherwise effected); and, entertaining doubts as to his authority, as Special Agent, to make this demand, Mr. Garstin takes this opportunity to submit, for the orders of Government, the general question of the Special Agent's power to apply to the authorities at Pondicherry for the extradition of offenders, as also of his power to comply with similar applications made to him by those authorities.

4. With regard to the reference made by the Magistrate of the Godavery District, it is observed that, in a case in which a similar reference was made by the Magistrate of Malabar in 1867,* the Government ruled that such cases should be dealt with under the provisions of the Extradition Act VII. of 1854. It was then pointed out that the proper course for the Chef de Service to adopt was to send a requisition, either through the Governor of the French Settlements in India, or direct to the Magistrate, for the delivery of the offender; whereupon it would be for the Government to issue an order for inquiry into the truth of the charge. It would then be the duty of the Magistrate, if he deemed the evidence sufficient, to issue a warrant for the apprehension of the accused; and subsequently, if, on further inquiry, he deemed the evidence sufficient for the committal of the accused, he would commit the accused to prison, and forward a report on the case, accompanied by copies of the depositions, to Government, with a view to the issue of an order of Government directing the accused to be delivered up to the French authorities; or, if the case should be one in which the immediate apprehension of the accused was, in the judgment of the Magistrate, necessary for the ends of justice, it was open to him to act on the provisions of Section 19 of the Act, by apprehending the accused, without the preliminary order provided for in Section 1.

5. It appears, however, that the procedure above indicated is not followed in all the Districts in this Presidency bordering on the French territories. In South Arcot, as the Special Agent states in his letter above recorded, it has been the practice for that Officer to surrender offenders to the French authorities at his discretion and without reference to Government. Similarly also, in regard to demands for the extradition of offenders, being British subjects, who take refuge in French territory, it has been customary for the Special Agent to make the application direct to the French authorities, who generally surrendered the accused without requiring such application to be made by the Government.

6. The Government observe that the provisions of both Act VII. of 1854 and Article 9 of the Treaty between England and France, dated 7th March 1815, require that in every case in which an application for extradition is allowable—such cases being limited to those of “heinous offences” falling within the purview of Section 21 or Section 22 of the Act, and to those in which “judicial proceedings shall be instituted” within the meaning of the Treaty—the demand for delivering up British subjects, as well as the surrender of foreign subjects, should be made by Government, or by their special authority obtained previously.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
26th July 1871.

7. As, however, the practice in this matter, which prevails in South Arcot, has never been objected to either by this Government or by the French authorities, the Government think it desirable that it should be maintained and made general with regard to all Districts in this Presidency bordering on French territory.

8. But before passing definite orders on the subject, the Government resolve to request the opinion of the Acting Advocate-General as to whether the extension of the practice observed in South Arcot is free from legal objection.

(True Extract.)

Captain, R. E.,

Under Secretary, P. W. D.,
for Chief Secretary.

To the Magistrate of the Godavery District.

.. Collector in charge of the Special Agent's Department at Cuddalore.
.. Government Solicitor.
.. Magistrate of Malabar.
.. .. of Tanjore.

Exd. J. Wright.

10
Judicial Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MARDAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter.

From the Magistrate of the
Godavery District

Dated 22nd May 1871 No 117

Letter from the Collector
& Special Agent in
South Arcot.

D. 21st June 1871 No 75

Order thereon 26th July 1871 No 1033

The letters above re-
-corded have reference
to the reciprocal surrender
on the part of the British
& French Governments,
of persons, who, being
charged with the commission
of offences in the terri-
-tory of the one State,
take refuge in that of
the other.

In the first letter
the Magistrate of the
Godavery District
reports that an applica-
-tion

167
Govt. of 1871

JUDICIAL.

To
THE MAGISTRATE OF THE
GODAVERY DISTRICT,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated July, 26th.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 26th July 1871, No. 1033.

JULY.

Nos. 156-158.

Requesting the opinion of the Advocate-General
as to whether the extension, to all districts border-
ing on French territory, of the practice observed
in South Arcot in the matter of the surrender, on
the part of the British and French Governments, of
persons, who, being charged with the commission of
offences in the territories of the one State, take
refuge in that of the other, is free from legal ob-
jection.

having been made to him
by the Chief de Service
at Yanam for the ren-
dition of a woman,
a native of that place,
charged with complicity
in an attempt to com-
mit murder, he inki-
-mated, in reply, that
under the provisions
of the Extradition
Act VII of 1854 the
accused could not be
delivered up without
the special order of
this Govt. but that
the Chief de Service
has questioned the
necessity for any
such order, contending
that as the French
Government has em-
-powered its officers
to dispose of all
applications for

extradition made by
officers of the British
Govt, without reference
to superior authority,
a reciprocal course
should be observed
in regard to similar
applications made by
the French authorities.
In the present case
the accused person, it
is stated, has since
surrendered herself
at Yanam. ^{Draper} Mr. ~~Draper~~
however, requests the
instructions of Govt
on the subject for
future guidance.

3. In the second letter
the Special Agent
in South Arcot refers
to an application
made to him by the
District Superintend-
-ent of Police for
demanding, of the

inquiry into the truth
of the charge. It was
then the duty of
the Magistrate, if he
deemed the evidence
sufficient, to issue
a warrant for the
apprehension of the
accused; and subsequent-
ly, if, on further en-
quiry, he deemed the
evidence sufficient
for the commitment
of the accused, he
would commit the ac-
cused to prison, and
forward a report on
the case, accompanied
by copies of the de-
positions, to Govt.
with a view to the
issue of an order
of Government di-
recting the accused

to be delivered up to
the French Authorities,
or, if the case should
be one in which the
immediate apprehension
of the accused was, in
the judgment of the
Magistrate, necessary
for the ends of justice,
it was open to him
to act on the provisions
of Section 19 of the Act,
by apprehending the
accused, without the
preliminary order
provided for in Section
5. It appears, however,
that the procedure
above indicated is
not followed in all
the Districts in this
Presidency bordering
on the French Terri-
tories. In South
Arcot

Arrest, as the Special Agent states in his letter above recorded, it has been the practice for that officer to surrender offenders to the French Authorities at his discretion and without reference to Government. Similarly also, in regard to demands for the extradition of offenders, being British subjects, who take refuge in French Territory, it has been customary for the Special Agent to make the application direct to the French Authorities who generally surrendered the accused, without requiring such application to be made by the Govt.

in every case in which an application for extradition is allowable - such cases being limited to those of "heinous offences" falling within the purview of Sec. 21 or Sec. 22 of the Act and to those in which "judicial proceedings shall be instituted" within the meaning of the Treaty.

14
6. The Govt observed that the provisions of both Act VII of 1854 & Article 9 of the Treaty between England and France dated 7 March 1815, require that the demand for ~~the extradition~~ ^{detaining up} of British subjects, as well as the surrender of foreign subjects, should be made by Govt, or by ^{authority} their special ~~order~~ ^{obtained previously} ~~in each case~~.

7. As, however, the practice in this matter, which prevails in South Africa, has never been objected to either by this Govt or ^{by the} French Authorities, the Govt think it desirable that it should be maintained and made general.

with regard to all
Districts in this Pre-
sidency bordering on
French territory.

8. But before making
definite orders on the
subject, the Govt resolve
to request the opinion
of the *Ag* Advocate
General as to whether
the extension of the
practice observed in
South Arcot is free
from legal objection.

L.A.

57 1810

To
The Magistrate of the Godavari District
The Collector of the ^{in charge of the} ~~Special Agents in the~~ ^{at Cuddalore} ~~at Cuddalore~~
The Govt. Solicitor
The Magistrate of Malabar
The Magistrate of Tanjore

Établissements Français

Re 183

Yanaon le 15 Mai

dans l'Inde

CHEF DE SERVICE

à YANAON.

N° 3

Monsieur le Collecteur.

J'ai l'honneur de vous accusé réception de votre lettre du
mai courant, N° 108, au sujet de l'extradition que je vous ai demandée par
ma lettre du 13 du même mois, N° 2,

1° du nommé Sangady Alchy, natif du territoire français
et qui s'était réfugié à Nillapilly (territoire anglais)

2° du nommé Sedalourada Maridaya de caste brame,
natif du territoire anglais, et y demeurant, tous les deux prévenus
de tentative d'assassinat par complicité, commis sur le territoire
français d'Yanaon.

En ce qui concerne le dernier, sujet anglais, je ne puis que
prendre acte de votre refus de le livrer et de la réponse que vous m'avez notifiée
d'après l'acte de 1854, de le traduire s'il y a lieu, devant la juridiction
anglaise; et vous prie seulement de vouloir bien remarquer qu'il s'agit
d'une simple prévention contre un individu, et que je vous demandais
de le faire conduire au Yanaon en tout pour qu'il fut entendu.

À Monsieur le Collecteur du District de Godavari.

C. Sedalourada

Translation.

3

From the Provisional Chief of the Service
at Yanaon to the Collector of the Goda-
vary district dated 17 May 1871 N° 3.

I have the honor to
acknowledge the re-
ceipt of your letter of
the 15th Inst. N° 108,
regarding the extra-
dition applied for in
my letter of the 13th idem
N° 2, first, of a wo-
man named Sangady
Alchy, a native of French
territory, who took refuge
at Nillapilly (British
territory) & second, of a
man named Seda-
lourada Maridaya of
the bramin caste, a
native of British terri-
tory & residing there,
both

13.11.11
Court of 1871} 20y mms.

Judicial

To
The Mayor of the City of London

152/72

Dated July 26. } 1871, No. 1033
Recd.

Nos. 158, 158.

No. 1580-1593.

opinion of the

Regulating the Alder and Street

and is written in it in relation to

all which having been made

known to the public and the

known in the Court as the

matter of the Alder and Street

and of the Alder and Street

and of the Alder and Street

and of the Alder and Street

and of the Alder and Street

and of the Alder and Street

and of the Alder and Street

and of the Alder and Street

220/7/71

both accused of complicity in an attempt at murder committed in the French territory of Yanam.

As regards the latter, a British subject, I can only accept the fact of your refusal to deliver him up, & of the reservation you have notified to me of arraigning him before a British tribunal under the Act of 1854, if there be grounds, & I beg you will see that there is but a mere accusation against this individual, & that I asked ^{you} to cause him to be brought to Yanam, mainly that he might hear & be confronted with

4
with the perpetrator of the crime & the witnesses. He can do this of his own accord, as the information shows that there is no ground for prosecuting him. In the contrary event, I shall forward to you the papers & everything else necessary to keep you informed.

As regards Sangady Atchy, a native of French territory & domiciled there, permit me to ask you whether it is not by the commission of a material error, that she has been included in the same decision passed by you.

I am the more confirmed in this supposition, since, holding as I

5
I do authority from my Govt. to do the needful in all cases of applications for the extradition of British subjects accused of crimes or common misdemeanors, I concluded from that, that, by reciprocity French subjects applied for, under the same conditions, by ^{the} French authorities, must be delivered up.

I have, however, to inform you that the accused, Sangady-Atchy, came here yesterday, & delivered herself up as a prisoner. Thus the difficulty

difficulty, in the particular case which has engaged our attention, has been solved; but I shall be obliged to you, nevertheless, if you will be so good as to answer the foregoing question with reference to the principle involved in it, in order to prevent any doubt, any misunderstanding, in similar cases, which may arise hereafter.

P.S. When I closed this letter, I received your further letter of the 16th. In reply I can only refer

refer you to the foregoing letter to see that we must wait until the trial has terminated.

True translation

J. W. Lyons.

French Translator

2/6/71

1000

No. 112

Gadagery District
Magistrate's Office
Locum tenens May 1911

From James Fraser Esq.
Magistrate
To Mr. Hudson Esq.
Acting Chief Secretary
to Government
Bombay

Sir,
I have the honor to
inform you that a person
a native French subject, a resident
of Yanam, was accused of
having been accessory to a heinous
crime committed in French terri-
tory and afterwards took refuge
in the Village of Telapilly, a por-
tuguese British territory.

2. His arrest and subsequent
was immediately claimed by the
Chief de Service of Yanam.

3. As it appeared to me that

* named
Langaoy
Atchi

8 May 1911 8-11-11

Recd 1871 Department

From The Magistrate
Gadagery District
No 1033 of 26-7-11
To the Acting Chief Secretary
to Government
Bombay

Dated 22

Bombay 24 May 1911

201076 No. 112

in case

The question mechanism
regarding the transfer of

of Criminals Committee
Council in French
territory and afterwards
taking refuge in the
British territory.

156

22/7/11

Section XXIII of Act VII of 1854
seems to me to require the previous
permission of Government in
writing for the surrender
of any person.

I have the honor to be
Your most obedient servant
J. Koser.
Magistrate

15 June 1871
J. K. 156

Mc

Mc

Camp. Colundrapett.
15th June 1871

N: 160.

From,
Captain J. H. B. Young,
Superintendent of Police South Arcot.
To, J. G. Parston Esq.
Magistrate Special Agent
South Arcot.

One George Hastings
on a charge of cheating has
absconded from Madras &
taken refuge in Pondicherry.
a Warrant has been issued
for his arrest by the Commissioner
of Police in Madras. I have
the honor to request you will
be good enough to address
the

The French authorities in
Pondicherry to surrender the
above offender to our Police
who are watching his
movements there.

I am Sir
Yours faithfully
J. M. B. Young Capt.
Supt of Police. &c.

1 True Copy 1

No 75

From

J. H. Garstin Esquire
Collector & Special Agent
South Arcot

To

W. Huddleston Esquire
Actg Chief Secretary to Government
Fort St. George

Sir,

In forwarding a copy of a
letter from the Superintendent of
Police of this District asking me to
demand the Extradition of one George
Hastings charged with Cheating, and
for whose arrest a Warrant has been
issued by the Commissioner of Police
at Madras, I have the honor to state,
that, in my opinion, I have no author-
ity to make this demand and to request
instructions from Government on the
general question of the Special Agents
power of making demands for Extra-
-dition

In a letter from
Collyer & Co
Agents, dated
27th June / 71
No 75.

Per post. 28th 10 26/3/71
In A No 156-157
Subst. 194/71.

Extradition from the Pondicherry authorities and for complying with those made by them of him -

2. I find that it has been customary for many years (ever since 1838 I believe) for the Special Agent to demand the Extradition of offenders taking refuge in Pondicherry and for the Pondicherry authorities to make demands for Extradition from the Special Agent of French offenders taking refuge in this District, the demands made by either party being seldom refused and being made at discretion & without reference to the Madras Government -

3. On looking over the records of the Special Agents office, I find that the office was first constituted in 1819 when Colonel Stuart Fraser was appointed, as the Madras Government inform him in their letter of the 13th December of that year, "with the view of forwarding and facilitating the transactions of public business and in order to preserve a
right

7
"right understanding with the Governments
"of the several foreign powers having settlements on the Coast of Coromandel" and
in his letter to the French Governor General Count Du Roy, of the same date, the Chief Secretary says at para. 2 "I request your Excellency to understand that this measure though adopted as an arrangement of general expediency is not intended to interrupt in any degree the usual course of official correspondence" so that unless it was intended by the above letter to Colonel Fraser that the power of making demands for Extradition under Article 9 of the Treaty of 1815, should be conferred upon him, I do not see how any such power could be legally exercised by his Successor, for by the wording of the said Article 9 "All Europeans and others whosever against whom judicial proceedings shall be instituted within the limits of the Settlements & Factories belonging to His Most Christian Majesty for offences committed, or for debts contracted, within the said limits, and who shall take refuge out of the same shall be delivered up to the Chiefs of the said

"Said Settlements and Factories, and all Euro-
peans and others whosoever against whom
judicial proceedings as aforesaid shall
be instituted without the said limits
and who shall take refuge within
the same shall be delivered up by
the Chiefs of the said Settlements &
Factories upon demand being made of them
by the British Government." So that
it would seem all demands for Extra-
dition by the French Authorities can
be made to the Special Agent and
should be complied with by him, but
all demands for Extradition by the
Special Agent must be made through
his Government to the French Authori-
ties. -

4. It will be very easy for me
to do as my predecessors have done and
to act according to my discretion in demand-
ing the Surrender of George Hastings ^{his arrest}
or not, but before making such a de- ^{last time}
mand I think it right to ascertain ^{of the Govt}
whether the Government are aware
of the existing practice and whether
it has their approval and sanction, and
in the latter case whether demands for
Extradition should be limited strictly
to

to the offences detailed in Section XXI
Act VII of 1854; or whether a demand
for Extradition should be made in
every case of a criminal offence ha-
ving been established *prima facie*
against an individual taking refuge
in a foreign Settlement, it being left
to the foreign authorities to accede to,
or refuse, the demands, or, lastly, whe-
ther in every case in which it may
be deemed proper that Extradition
should be demanded, such demand
should be forwarded to Government.
5. I presume that the same
should be followed in acceding to, or
refusing Extradition demands as in
making them. -

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
J. H. G. Archib.
Collector & Special Agent.

South Arcot
Cuddalore
21st June 1871

$$\begin{array}{r} 1035 \\ \hline 287 \cdot 71 \end{array}$$

1. 1842

17th Dec. 1960

West 1869

1

18 June 1971

231

4

1000

1

Dear Mother

From the Dept.

According to

on our first ground

W. County, N. H.

19

John C. Fane

near the island

2. social theor

10

10

C 20/7/71 157
B 24